



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,466	02/09/2001	Jason Bowser	57654-014	6186

7590

06/02/2004

SAMUEL W. APICELLI
DUANE MORRIS, LLP
305 NORTH FRONT STREET
P.O. BOX 1003
HARRISBURG, PA 17108-1003

EXAMINER

HAVAN, THU THAO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2672

16

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/782,466

Applicant(s)

BOWSER ET AL.

Examiner

Thu-Thao Havan

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments, see Affidavit, filed September 29, 2003, with respect to prior date of Ange (US patent no. 6,121,963) was not valid have been fully considered and are persuasive. The office action of January 12, 2004 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims **1-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanna et al. (US patent no. 5,923,791) in view of Kenner et al. (US patent 5,956,716).

Re claims **1 and 9**, Hanna teaches a method for generating multi-image video streams comprising providing a source of images (col. 1, lines 16-42), selecting some but not all of the images of interest in accordance with a predetermined criteria for subsequent sequential display (col. 3, lines 1-21), stitching together the selected images to form a sequence of images (col. 5, lines 30-65), generating a video data stream from the selected images (col. 6, lines 10-56), configuring the video data stream in a format displayable in a browser without the use of plug-ins (fig. 7). In other words, Hanna teaches replaces a first pattern in a video scene with a second pattern by first detecting

the first pattern in the video scene and estimating the pose of this detected first pattern with respect to a reference object in the video scene. The second pattern is then geometrically transformed using the pose estimate of the detected first pattern. Finally, the detected first pattern is replaced with the geometrically-transformed second pattern. His system consisting of detecting a first pattern in a video scene, means for estimating the pose of this detected first pattern with respect to a reference object in the video scene, means for geometrically transforming the second pattern using the pose estimate of the detected first pattern, and means for replacing the detected first pattern with the geometrically-transformed second pattern.

Hanna fails to teach video clips. However, Kenner teaches video clips (col. 4, line 36 to col. 6, line 60; figs. 2-3). He teaches a user requests a desired video clip, the request is processed by a primary index manager. In that the local retrieval unit checks its storage to see whether the requested video clips are available locally. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the video clips of Kenner to the system of Hanna because it would have enable a distributed computer system or network whereby video clips and text information, stored locally and at a remote location, can be requested and viewed at a user's multimedia terminal (Kenner col. 4, line 36 to col. 6, line 60).

Re claim 2, Hanna teaches a video camera is used to provide a source of images (col. 5, lines 30-50). In other words, Ange teaches a multimedia video proving a source of images such as different movies.

Re claim 3, Hanna teaches a series of still frame images are used to provide a source of images (fig. 2). Figure 2 of Hanna disclose the still frame images.

Re claim 4, Hanna teaches a plurality of drawings are used to provide a source of images (col. 11, lines 50-67).

Re claim 5, Hanna teaches number of images selected is based on the total number of images in the source of images (col. 12, line 14-65). In other words, Hanna teaches the first image of the sequence, the second image of the sequence, and etc. images are selected and search for the landmarks.

Re claim 6, Hanna teaches total number of images selected is based on a fixed time interval (col. 13, line 64 to col. 14, line 15). Hanna teaches fixed time interval when he discloses the time interval for the presentation of the video stream.

Re claim 7, Kenner teaches JavaScript (col. 2, lines 6-22). Kenner discloses Java language.

Re claim 8, Hanna teaches source of images represents one full rotation of an object of interest (col. 7, lines 20-35). In other words, Hanna discloses rotation/zooming of an object.

Re claims 10-11, Kenner teaches adding metadata into the video clip (col. 4, lines 36-64). In other words, Kenner teaches video clip storage and retrieval system whereby the user receives comprehensive data collected from one or more databases.

Re claim 12, Kenner teaches metadata may be used for searching (col. 4, lines 43-64). The request unit of Kenner is used for searching.

Re claim **13**, Hanna teaches editor is a personal computer (col. 2, lines 8-30). In other words, Hanna's system is in computer consisting to resolution correction.

Re claims **14-15 and 17-18**, the limitations of claims 14-15 and 17-18 are identical to claims 1 and 9 above. Therefore, claims 14-15 and 17-18 are treated the same as discussed with respect to claims 1 and 9 above.

Re claim **16**, Hanna a sound clip associated with the video sequence is stored in a cell associated with the video, and is played in conjunction with the display of the video (col. 4, lines 16-47).

Re claim **19**, Kenner teaches control device is a mouse (col. 1, line 58 to col. 2, line 5). In other words, Kenner teaches clicking with a mouse.

Re claim **20**, Kenner teaches control device is a soft button on the display (col. 8, lines 34-50). Kenner teaches MPEG which has buttons on the display.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu-Thao Havan whose telephone number is (703) 308-7062. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (703) 305-4713.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Art Unit: 2672


or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Thu-Thao Havan
Art Unit: 2672



MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600